

**TRANSMITTAL  
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number 09/848,430

Filing Date May 4, 2001

First Named Inventor Jeffrey T. Kreulen

Art Unit 2176

Examiner Name Laurie Anne Ries

Attorney Docket Number ARC9200000023US1

**ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	<b>Remarks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<b>APPELLANTS' SECOND RESPONSE TO BOARD'S NEW REJECTION</b> <i>Appeal No. 2007-0429</i>	

**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm Name	McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC 8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200, Vienna, Virginia 22182		
Signature			
Printed name	Frederick E. Cooperrider, Esq.		
Date	April 11, 2008	Reg. No.	36,769

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature	HAND DELIVERED		
Typed or printed name		Date	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Appellants' Response to Board's New Rejection  
S/N: 09/848,430



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of

Kreulen, et al.

**Serial No.: 09/848,430**

Group Art Unit: 2176

Filed: May 4, 2001

Examiner: Ries, Laurie Anne

For: **AN EFFICIENT STORAGE MECHANISM FOR REPRESENTING TERM  
OCCURRENCE IN UNSTRUCTURED TEXT DOCUMENTS**

Commissioner of Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPELLANTS' SECOND RESPONSE TO BOARD'S NEW REJECTION**

Sir:

Appellants respectfully respond hereinbelow to the Board's response in the DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING, mailed on March 24, 2008, for the above-identified application, since the remarks in this DECISION suggests that a key point of Appellants' response was misunderstood by the Board's review.

Although Appellants do not dispute that Call paragraph [0139] does indeed suggest using his data compression technique in an e-book, this data compression usage alone does not suggest or imply that chapters of the e-book are arranged within a single document, as would be required to satisfy the plain meaning of the rejected independent claims.

The most that can reasonably be concluded from using Call's data compression technique in an e-book comprising a plurality of documents for its e-book chapters is that there would be a corresponding plurality of vectors for these chapters, rather than a single vector representing the entirety of the e-book.

Docket ARC920000023US1

That is, there is no evidence in the Board's rejection that demonstrates that an e-book is structured so that one document actually contains a plurality of documents, each of the plurality of documents being one of the e-book chapters, so that the resultant single "super document" could then be subjected to the data compression technique described by Call to thereby satisfy the plain meaning of the claim language of the rejected independent claims.

Rather, as Appellants pointed out in their previous response, if each chapter in an e-book is stored as a single document (e.g., so that it can be retrieved), then the e-book would be expected to be stored in a directory structure of some sort, not a single document having a plurality of documents residing therein, each document representing a chapter of the e-book.

Without having demonstrated that an e-book having a plurality of chapters, each chapter being a document itself, is in turn stored as a single "super" document of some sort, itself made up of documents, then there is no suggestion that an e-book stores the plurality of chapters as a single vector that would be subject to Call's data compression technique within that single document. Rather, the result of applying the data compression technique of Call into an e-book would be a plurality of compressed documents that happen to be related as being chapters in an e-book, as indicated by an appropriate directory structure or other such hierarchical indication method.

Appellants' make this point that an e-book has to be presumed to use a normal directory structure for a plurality of documents interrelated as chapters in an e-book because the motivation behind the present invention is not related to the environment one would expect to find in an e-book that comprises a few text documents as chapters of the e-book.

Rather, in the analogy of "chapters of an e-book", the present invention arose from the problem of a document corpus typically having thousands of very short chapters, as explained on page 7 of the disclosure (also refer to page 13, wherein is described a corpus having a million or more documents). To be efficient, as also explained on page 7, the text search of such a document corpus would use a small sparse matrix representation.

Appellants' Response to Board's New Rejection  
S/N: 09/848,430

This characteristic of having a very large number of "chapters" (e.g., hundreds of thousands of chapters) represented in a small sparse matrix representation would not be typical for an e-book, so there would be no reason to make the few (relatively long text) documents (e.g., chapters) of a normal e-book into a single vector for purpose of searching the e-book contents. Nor would there be an undue overhead burden of opening/closing documents for only a few text documents.

Therefore, Appellants again respectfully submit that the usage of the data compression technique of Call does not render obvious the additional step of first concatenating documents (e.g., chapters) of an e-book into a single vector of documents and then applying the Call data compression technique to this concatenated single "document" made up of the plurality of chapters, absent additional showing not currently of record in the Board's rejection.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Appellants submit that claims 1-25, all the claims presently pending in the application, are clearly enabled and patentably distinct from the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Thus, the Board is respectfully requested to remove all rejections, including its own new rejection for claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 15, 18, and 20-22, or to provide additional evidence that supports this rejection that demonstrates that chapters of an e-book are not arranged in a directory structure, as one would predict for a plurality of documents (e.g., each document being a chapter) that make up an e-book.

Please charge any deficiencies and/or credit any overpayments necessary to enter this paper to Assignee's Deposit Account number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 04/11/08



Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Reg. No. 36,769

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC.  
8231 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
Customer Number: 21254